

ESTABLISHED 1870.

NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1920—EIGHTEEN PAGES

PRICE THREE CENTS

COX GIVES PRAISE
TO HIRAM JOHNSONDeclares Progressive Californian
Shared Fate of Roosevelt

BIDS FOR WESTERN VOTES

Democratic Leader Speaks at Sacramento, Scoring Boss Tactics of Republicans and Seeking Progressive Vote in Pacific State.

Sacramento, Cal., Sept. 17.—In an address here today opening his California campaign, Governor Cox of Ohio declared that Hiram Johnson, republican, as an exponent of progressivism and again played "big names" and republican leaders supporting Senator Harding.

Although they differ fundamentally on the league of nations, Governor Cox said, he admired Senator Johnson for frankness and lack of ambiguity or hypocrisy.

"He and I do not agree on international policies," said Governor Cox to a large theater audience at a meeting "but I respect the man for his candor."

Praise for Johnson.

"As an Ohioan I give you the assurance that the observation made by a distinguished citizen of our state to the effect that Hiram Johnson was a blackguard and unfit to associate with decent men is not the view of our people."

"Let me recall a parallel between the campaigns of 1912 and 1920."

"Eight years ago Colonel Roosevelt charged that the nomination was made by reactionary forces in defiance of the rank and file as expressed at the primaries. In 1920, precisely the same thing was done and Senator Johnson was humiliated the same as Colonel Roosevelt. To his neighbors when he returned home as the Chicago convention this year he expressed no bitterness and plainly that he would rather come back to his home state defeated than to have been nominated in a room of a Chicago hotel by representatives of big business. His further observation was 'a few men have set at naught for the time being the American primary system.'"

Source G. D. P. Bosses.

"It is true and it would be futile to say that there are many Cranes, Cramers and representatives of Morgan & Co. who arrogate to themselves a right of selection of candidates, notwithstanding what may have been said by the people themselves."

"I am unable to see by what process of reasoning the political party which has given us boss Barnes as New York's distinct status of leadership in this campaign can expect the progressive friends of Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram Johnson to give it support."

"Never have so many obligations designed interests been assumed by the party of reaction as in this campaign."

"In this great western country where I have been now for two weeks, I find many evidences of resentment. I am convinced that the streets of independent and progressive thought will be running so hot by November that unbridled passions will have been completely quelled."

WOMAN IN OREGON HAS
OUTSTARVED M'SWINEY40 Days Without Food
—Irish Striker Begins

His 36th Day.

Seaside, Ore., Sept. 17.—Mrs. M. Lane, of Roseburg, yesterday completed a 40-day fast during which she partook of no nourishment except a little orange and lemon juice and water. Mrs. Lane had been suffering with chronic stomach trouble for many years and was advised last week that she was in danger of her life. She lost 25 pounds in weight during that time, but never was confined to her bed. Her first food was a small amount of soup.

London, Sept. 17.—Lord Mayor Terence MacSwiney, of Cork, who today on the 36th day of his hunger strike in Brixton prison, passed a somewhat better night and had a little sleep, said a bulletin issued at 10 o'clock this morning by the Irish Self-Determination League. The bulletin said the pains he had suffered in his back continued but that he was not suffering from the pain in his chest from which he has frequently complained. It was declared a doctor found him appreciably weaker, that he was still conscious.

A dispatch to the home office from a doctor at Brixton prison declared there was no change in the lord mayor's condition except that a gradual deterioration was noticeable daily.

RUPTURE PETITION.

London, Sept. 17.—William H. Hartford, a twin brother, had a voluntary petition in bankruptcy filed in the London court at 11.25 a.m.

D. L. & W. R. R. TO SEGREGATE
COAL AND RAIL PROPERTIES,
WOULD DOUBLE ITS CAPITALREVISED CASUALTIES
SHOW 36 ARE KILLED

But Two Bodies Are Unidentified—List of Injured Swelled to Over 200.

New York, Sept. 17.—Thirty-six persons, two of them unidentified lost their lives in the explosion yesterday in Wall street according to a revised casualty list issued at noon today. The number of injured is said to approximate 200 with exact figures unobtainable because scores received emergency treatment outside of hospitals. The revised list of dead follows:

Joseph Arambury, 28 years, a West Indian, Bronx.

Reginald Ellsworth, West Orange, N. J.

Bartholomew Flannery, 19, messenger, New York.

Franklin G. Miller, 20, New York.

Harold L. Gillies, Pelham, N. Y.

Charles Hanrahan, Brooklyn.

Raymond Miller, no address.

Thomas W. Ostrey, no address.

Benjamin Soloway, 16, Brooklyn.

Joseph Schmidt, 30, Long Island City.

John W. Weir, New York.

Margaret Fisher, Brooklyn.

John Donahue, Brooklyn.

William Joyce, 24, Brooklyn, clerk in Morgan office.

Carolyn Dickinson, Elmhurst, L. I.

Mrs. Margaret Drury, Brooklyn.

North Bayley Ellsworth 52, Washington, D. C.

William F. Hutchinson, Garden City, L. I.

John Johnson, New York.

Bernard J. Kennedy, Brooklyn.

Alexander Leigh, New York.

Charles Lindrothe, Brooklyn.

Colin B. McClure, 25, Yonkers.

Alfred Mayer, New York.

Col. Charles A. Neville, U. S. A., Savannah, Ga.

Rudolph Portny, Jamaica, L. I.

Edward A. Sweet, Brooklyn.

Robert Westday, New York.

Mildred Zylander, New York.

Lewis K. Smith, New York.

Jerome H. McKee, broker, Bronx.

Mr. Arthur, address unknown.

L. L. Roberts, New York.

Joseph Arambury, Brooklyn.

Two bodies still unidentified at morgue.

A revised list of the known injured from outside New York city was announced this afternoon as follows:

Raymond McQuade, Yonkers.

Raymond Reddington, banker, New Monmouth, N. J.

Arthur Geiterole, North Arlington, N. J.

John G. Bronyau, Hilledale, N. J.

H. Weill, employee of the Shanghai Bank, address unknown.

Frank Vaneck, Westchester.

Samuel Diamond, Jersey City.

Frank Stova, Bergenfield, N. J.

William Peterson, Bogota, N. J.

Leo K. Drury, Washington, D. C.

John Paick, Sacramento, Cal.

Mrs. Lena Paick, wife of John Paick.

T. C. Peck, Jr., Nyack, N. Y.

L. W. Roberts, address unknown.

Elmer Diamond, Passaic, N. J.

James B. Baer, Burlington, N. J.

James Butta, Yonkers.

Arthur J. G. Cole, North Arlington, N. J.

Joseph Dickman, Plandome, N. Y.

Paul Dorkin, Hoboken, N. J.

Walter Dickinson, Yonkers.

Martin Ellis, West New York, N. J.

William Foley, Englewood, N. J.

Floyd Johnson, Yonkers.

A. B. Jessup, Jeddo, Pa.

John Kunkle, Cranford, N. J.

George Lohr, Freeport, N. Y.

John Markle, Jeddo, Pa.

Harry McGuire, Jersey City.

J. W. Ridge, Mount Vernon, N. Y.

George Watt, Somerville, N. J.

James B. Robertson, Bayonne, N. J.

William Folden, Freeport, N. Y.

Albert Siegel, Glendale, N. Y.

Fred W. Thompson, Woodhaven, N. Y.

F. Gelfair, Port Richmond, N. Y.

Charles H. Childs, Utica, N. Y.

J. P. Conway, Richmond Hills, N. Y.

Harland West, Yonkers.

H. R. McIntyre, Yonkers.

Chances for foreigners who do not read or write English will be conducted at the Grammar, Bartlett and Elthu Burritt schools. All classes are free and enrollments will be made on Monday evening.

Uncle Worth \$50,000,000, Charges Latter Was of Unsound Mind.

Salem, Mass., Sept. 17.—The issues upon which Albert W. Searles, a Boston artist, will attempt to break the will of his uncle, Edward F. Searles, of Methuen and New York, which left the residue of an estate estimated at \$50,000,000 to Arthur T. Walker, of New York, a clerk, will include the question whether the millionaire was of sound mind when the will was drawn and whether it was procured through fraud and undue influence.

Formal notice to this effect was made by counsel for the contesting parties.

Governor Kilby called out troops when informed by Sheriff Clark Guthrie of Walker county that feeling had grown bitter between mine guards and miners, and that armed bands were gathering.

SEPARATION WOULD
BENEFIT CONCERN

Under Present Methods

With Assets Combined Increase of Capital Stock is Made Impossible.

Washington, Sept. 17.—The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western railroad applied to the interstate commerce commission today for permission to segregate its rail and coal properties.

The company also asked permission to issue additional capital stock to the full amount of its surplus now estimated at about \$90,000,000. Its present capitalization is less than \$43,000,000 the application said, while its rail investment exceeds \$87,000,000.

Has Dual Capacity.

"Since early in its history," the application continued, "applicant has been functioning in the dual capacity of coal mining company, holding in fee and by lease, and operating large tracts of anthracite coal lands, and of transportation company, operating an important system of railroads."

"Such ownership and operation of coal lands has subjected it to laws preventing it from expanding its capitalization to keep pace with the growth of its assets as it would otherwise have had the right to do. It is now ready to segregate its coal properties from its rail properties and to thereafter continue as a transportation company only and thus place itself in position, subject to this commission's assent, to accept the benefits of general laws of Pennsylvania permitting it to increase its capitalization to more nearly conform to its assets and to what such capitalization would doubtless have been but for the operation of such restrictive laws."

Put Co. in Bad Light.

"The declaration of dividends at a rate abnormally high when compared with the dividend rate of other railroads operating in the same territory has led to the unwarranted conclusion on the part of the public that applicant has earned and is earning a grossly excessive return on its investment in property devoted to public use. An increase in capital stock as is here proposed would tend to remove this source of distrust and suspicion."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

PALMER IS ADVISED
OF PACKERS' MERGERFederal Trade Commission Says
It Is Monopoly

NO SEPARATION INTENDED

Federal Trade Commission Says
It Is Monopoly

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

"The plan, as outlined, in the opinion of the commission, is an infraction of the monopoly-law of the land, greater and more serious than the existing infraction."

Washington, Sept. 17.—The plan proposed by the "big five" packers to dispose of their stockyard interests to F. H. Prince and Company of Boston will not result in the separation of the stockyards from packer interests, the Federal Trade Commission declared today in a report to Attorney-General Palmer.

Two Reasons Given.

The commission gave two reasons for its conclusion as follows:

"The long-time stockyard relations of F. H. Prince with the packers have been such that the plan will not result, in the opinion of the commission, in a divestment of the stockyards from packer interests."

FINANCIAL CENTERS OF EVERY
CITY IN COUNTRY IS UNDER GUARD
TO PREVENT NEW BOMB EXPLOSION

Speaks Here Today.



FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Democratic vice presidential nominee Franklin D. Roosevelt and Hon. Augustine Lonergan who was the choice of the state democrats for state senator to oppose Senator Frank Brandegee in the coming elections, will speak this afternoon at 5 o'clock in Turner hall. Mr. Roosevelt will be introduced by Chairman P. F. King and his address will be followed by that of Mr. Lonergan.

The democrats' town committee has arranged to receive and entertain the candidates from 4 to 6 o'clock. A band concert will be held at the green in Central Park, followed by a street parade.

FRENCH ELECTION IS
EXPECTED ON SEPT. 24Popular Demand is Miller-
and For President But
He Doesn't Want It.

Paris, Sept. 17. (By The Associated Press).—A successor to Paul Deschanel as president of France will be elected on Friday, September 24, according to general belief in political circles today, although the date will not be definitely fixed until after the meeting of parliament on Tuesday, when the president's resignation, handed to Premier Millerand at Rambouillet yesterday, will be placed before the legislative bodies.

The successor, it appeared today, will be Alexandre Millerand, the present premier, unless the premier's powers of resistance to a call to the office prove greater than the rapidly accumulating force of public sentiment favoring him for the chief magistracy.

Premier Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Millerand's colleagues in the cabinet were insistent at today's meeting that the premier should signify his willingness to accept the presidency of the republic in succession to M. Deschanel. The premier, however, persisted in his refusal to consider such a step, declaring he felt it incumbent upon him to continue the work he had undertaken as premier.

Chief Flynn of U. S. Secret Service
That Infernal Machine Was Placed
Street by Mysterious Man Who
Being Sought.